1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSE PALEO et al..

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:22-cr-00180-LK

ORDER DEFERRING RULING ON MOTION TO PERMIT TRAVEL AND REQUESTING SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Ryan Holmquist's Motion to Permit Travel, seeking the Court's permission to travel to the District of Idaho from July 25, 2023 to July 27, 2023 "for the purpose of a family visit." Dkt. No. 164 at 1; Dkt. No. 164-1. According to Mr. Holmquist, United States Pretrial Services "has no objection to the proposed travel," but has indicated that a court order is necessary "to authorize travel to another judicial district." Dkt. No. 164 at 1. The Government also "has no objection to Mr. Holmquist's request to travel." Dkt. No. 166 at 2.

Mr. Holmquist is out of custody pursuant to the terms of an appearance bond entered on October 28, 2022. Dkt. No. 63. He maintains that "[t]he only restriction on travel is that he is not ORDER DEFERRING RULING ON MOTION TO PERMIT TRAVEL AND REQUESTING SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING - 1

permitted to travel outside the continental United States, or as directed by Pretrial Services." Dkt. No. 164 at 1. However, the special conditions listed in his appearance bond show that he is also subject to a location monitoring program that restricts his location to his residence "at all times except for employment, religious services, medical, legal reasons, or as otherwise approved by the location monitoring specialist." Dkt. No. 63 at 1.

Accordingly, no later than July 18, 2023, Mr. Holmquist is ordered to inform the Court whether Pretrial Services' lack of objection to his proposed travel qualifies as approval by the location monitoring specialist or if additional approval or temporary modification of his special

3725615, at *1 (E.D. Wash. Aug. 29, 2017) (denying motion to travel without prejudice based on

conditions is necessary. Cf. United States v. Gaines, No. 2:17-CR-00101-WFN-20, 2017 WL

finding that a defendant had not provided "enough information about the requested travel for this

Court to consider the motion").

Dated this 14th day of July, 2023.

Lauren King

Leuren Vinz

United States District Judge